DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 164 EA 015 257

TITLE	Bilingual Education for Hispanics: Issues of Language, Access and Equity.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. Inst. for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	13p.; Bound with: IFG Policy Perspectives (Aut 1981), "Title VII, Bilingual Education: Developing Issues of Diversity and Equity." Not available in paper copy due to small print and colored paper of original document.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications, Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, School of Education/CERAS Building, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)
JOURNAL CIT	IFG Policy Notes; v2 n4 Aut 1981
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Advisory Committees; *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Education Programs; Educational History; Educational Objectives; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; *Hispanic Americans; Lobbying; Parents; Program Evaluation; School Desegregation; Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; Lau v Nichols

ABSTRACT

This collection of short articles focuses on bilingual education for Hispanics. The lead article cites statistics concerning the education of Hispanics, the segregation of Hispanics in schools, and the educational level they are likely to attain. The second article presents a historical perspective on bilingual education in American schools and analyzes reasons for resistance to bilingual education. In the third article, the author looks at the interest groups that support bilingual education, their past growth, and imperiled future. Another article examines diversity in schools and the apparent tension between desegregation and bilingual education. A brief article outlines research findings on the involvement of parents in bilingual advisory groups. A final lengthy article deals with Title VII and bilingual education. The authors look at the history of Title VII, including the years from 1968 to 1974 in which its educational objectives were identified, the years 1974 to 1979 in which the greatest growth in basic programs and appropriations occurred, and the years 1978 to the present consisting primarily of reflection, deregulation, and reauthorization. The article concludes by acknowledging the wide-reaching impact of bilingual education, urging its continuation, and warning that there are problem issues raised by it that cannot be ignored. (Author/JM)

ED224164

BILINGUAL EDUCATION FOR HISPANICS
Issues of Language, Access and Equity

By virtually all indicators, Hispanic children face a poorer educational present and future than do other children.

Hispanic children attended more segregated schools in 1976 than they did in 1970. The table demonstrates this dramatic national trend by regions. More than two thirds of all Hispanic students were enrolled in public schools in which 50% of the enrollment was minority.

Hispanic students are far less likely to complete high school or graduate with their age group than are majority or even most minority students. Attrition rates, which tend to understate the extent of dropout, show that 1978 high school completion rates for Hispanics who were 25 years or older were only 34.3% compared with 67.1% for non-Hispanics over 25. The Hispanic students who did remain in school fell behind their classmates until 24% of the 14-20 year olds were enrolled two grades behind their classmates; only 9% of white students were 2 years behind their age cohorts.

In most states, bilingual programs remain inadequate in diagnosing linguistic competence and in providing bilingual curricula and personnel. Tests and other instruments have not been developed to measure the cognitive and English speaking abilities of linguistic minority children. Even when Hispanic children are diagnosed as limited-English or non-English proficient, fewer than half are enrolled in bilingual programs. Few classrooms have Hispanic teachers; in 1976, less than 3% of all public school employees were Hispanic, with nearly as many Hispanic service workers (custodians) as Hispanic teachers.

The failure of school systems to meet the needs of Hispanic communities is mirrored in postsecondary institutions, where limited access, discriminatory employment practices, and high attrition disproportionately affect Hispanic students.

Although there is a public perception that Hispanic college enrollments have greatly increased in recent years, the reality is very different. Hispanic students have not attained access into a broad range of institutions despite an increase in their numbers in the postsecondary system. From 1970 to 1978, Hispanic full-time students increased from 2.1% of the total to 3.5% of college enrollments. However, Hispanics are concentrated at the less prestigious and less well-funded institutions. In 1978, only 23% of white full-time students attended two year colleges, while 42% of Hispanic students attended these institutions. The skewed distribution indicates that a large percentage of full-time Hispanic students are attending institutions established for commuting, part-time students. California, which accounts for nearly one-third of all Hispanic enrollments, actually experienced a decline of more than 6000 Hispanic full-time enrolled students in the two year college sector from 1976 to 1978. These figures suggest that Hispanic penetration into educational in-

EA 015 257

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TABLE 1

Number and percent of Hispanic students attending public schools in selected school districts, [1] by minority[2] composition of school: 1970-1976

Geographic area	Number of Hispanic students (000s)	Percent of Hispanic students attending: Schools with 0-49 % minority students	Schools with 50-89 % minority students	Schools with 90-100 % minority students
United States:				
1970	1,563,647	34.6	35.2	30.2
1972	1,671,011	34.1	35.7	30.3
1974	1,747,658	32.2	36.6	31.1
1976	1,903,811	28.7	38.6	32.6

[1]For purposes of comparison, analysis was restricted to the 1,910 school districts which were included in all four surveys. The selected districts include approximately 67 percent of all Hispanic students enrolled in public schools in the United States in 1976.
[2]Minority students include all students other than white, non-Hispanic.
NOTE. Details may not add to totals because of rounding.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Distribution of Students by Racial/Ethnic Compositon of Schools 1970-1976*, August 1978.

stitutions has not been deep nor access widespread.

Hispanic students do not even have full access into open door institutions. Twenty-one colleges in the Continental U.S. enroll 24% of all Hispanic students there and when the 34 Puerto Rican institutions are included, these 55 colleges enroll 43% of all U.S. Hispanic students. Unlike other minority students who benefit from historically black or tribal colleges, Hispanic students do not have access to a similar network of Hispanic colleges. Thus, Hispanic students are concentrated in fewer than 2% of the more than 3100 collegiate institutions in the country, and they do not have historical missions to serve Hispanic students.

The leadership of these schools is decidedly non-Hispanic. In summer, 1981, there are 5 Hispanic four year college presidents, and 16 Hispanic two year college presidents in the Continental U.S. A survey of two-year college trustees noted that only .6% were Hispanic, while a study of postsecondary coordinating boards found 1.1% of the commissioners to be Hispanic. Little evidence suggests that significant leadership will be drawn from faculty ranks, as only 1.4% of all faculty (and 1.1% of all tenured professors) are Hispanic, including faculty in Spanish and bilingual education departments. With many Hispanics employed in special assistant or affirmative action/equal employment staff capacities, even fewer hold substantial policymaking positions.

Hispanic education issues have not been sufficiently examined even by equity researchers or bilingual educators. The structural disadvantages facing Hispanic learners are so great and so intertwined with relative political powerlessness that neither the nature nor the severity of the disadvantages are fully understood. ■

WHAT IS HISPANIC?

Although 'Hispanic' is the term that is being used increasingly to refer to populations who derive from Spanish-speaking origins, its meaning is often ambiguous. It is a generic term used originally and primarily by governmental agencies attempting to identify minority peoples. Its usefulness is limited to such formal purposes because of the diversity of peoples it encompasses. More importantly, the term is a controversial one and many groups of Hispanics prefer to identify themselves by other criteria.

Hispanic refers to all individuals whose ancestry is primarily Ibero/Latin American. It includes native Portuguese, Spanish, Mexican, Central or South Americans, Cubans, natives of former Spanish/Portuguese Caribbean possessions, and the descendants of these peoples. Hispanic is strictly a cultural and linguistic designation. It has no racial meaning and virtually all human races are represented among Hispanics. The range of residency of this group is characteristic of its diversity. Hispanics include citizens of Texas, California, and New Mexico, who resided for generations in the Southwest, as well as recent arrivals from Central America and the Caribbean.

Only in situations of cultural contrast, as in the U.S., has a class meaning been assigned to the term. Because poorer members of Hispanic countries have immigrated to the U.S., as with earlier immigrations of other groups, Hispanics are over-represented in lower-status occupations such as domestic service, farm work, and clothing manufacture. The ethnic identification of Hispanics has become largely congruent with class lines as perceived by the majority society. ■

The Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance (IFG) is a national research and development center funded principally by the National Institute of Education (NIE) under authority of section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act as amended by Section 403 of the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482). The Institute is administered through the School of Education at Stanford University and is located in the Center for Educational Research at Stanford (CERAS).

IFG *Policy Notes* is a quarterly newsletter produced with support from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the National Institute of Education or the Department of Education. Nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. Reprint rights are granted with proper credit.

Policy Notes welcomes your comments and suggestions. For additional information regarding IFG, copies of papers listed herein, or the announcements of past and future IFG publications, please contact:

Sandra Kirkpatrick
Assistant Director for Dissemination
IFG — CERAS Building
Stanford University
Stanford, Calif., 94305-1691
(415) 497-2754

POLICY NOTES

Thomas James
Richard Navarro
Nancy C. Stone ..... Editors
Beatriz Arias ..... Consulting Editor
Epseranza Kelly ..... Support Staff

ADMINISTRATION OF IFG

Henry M. Levin ..... Director, IFG
Jay G. Chambers ..... Associate Director, IFG
Bernadine Murray ..... Assistant Director, Administration, IFG
Sandra L. Kirkpatrick ..... Assistant Director, Dissemination, IFG

VIEWS AND VOICES: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Editorial by Jose Cardenas

Bilingual education in American schools has surfaced and waned in response to historical and political circumstances. Following World War II almost all bilingual instruction disappeared because of a nationalistic anti-foreign movement sweeping the nation. It resurfaced in the mid-1960s as the Great Society programs attempted to extend opportunities to groups previously denied the fruits of our bountiful land.

The civil rights movement called attention to alarming statistics on Hispanic populations and other language minority groups in this country. Though educational systems kept inadequate records, it was apparent that Hispanics were doing poorly in school. Studies over a twenty year period indicated that Mexican-American students still have the lowest educational attainment of all ethnic groups in the U.S. Equally deplorable, test data indicated that language minority children performed consistently below national norms.

The education of these children reflects a massive failure of the instructional methodologies employed. Prior to the 1950s it was mostly "cold turkey" and "sink or swim," similar to what educators today describe as immersion. The children were cut off from their native language in school. Success was wholly dependent upon the child's ability to swim in a new language environment. The alarming dropout rates represented those who sank, having failed in the overwhelming task of simultaneously mastering a new language, basic skills in the new language, and other course content. Immersion proved the fallacy of attempting to teach children basic reading skills in a language they could not understand.

In the mid-1950s there surfaced a structured approach to the acquisition of English as a Second Language (ESL). Though vastly superior to immersion, ESL has not lived up to expectations. During the initial period of schooling, language minority children concentrate on English language skills prior to attacking basic skills. Deferring the acquisition of basic skills and content until a command of the English language has been established proves to be a guarantee that language minority children will remain academically retarded and overaged for their grade throughout their schooling. Of more serious consequence is the disruption of cognitive development while English is being acquired as a second language. In view of these problems, it is ironic that this approach is still being used in its basic form and in several variations.

By the mid-1960s dissatisfactions with immersion and ESL led to the quest for better ways to instruct children of limited English proficiency, incorporating the positive aspects of ESL but without the discontinuity in cognitive development. Educators began to advocate a bilingual approach to provide children with understandable instruction in their native language in order to continue cognitive and affective development. This is combined with a structured ESL program. Then, when the child has a command of the English language, basic skills acquired in the native language are further developed in English. In addition, the school may also choose to foster the native language as a desirable goal.

With the passage of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and complementary legislation in the states, bilingual programs flourished in educational institutions enrolling large numbers of language minority children.

Enthusiastic support for bilingual education lasted only one decade. By the end of the 1970s there was growing resistance to further development of bilingual programs. The reasons for this backlash are varied, but there are three main characteristics:

1. Bilingual Education as an External Response.

Bilingual education was developed outside of mainstream education and faced the problem of becoming incorporated as an instructional methodology into the existing system. Innovations tend to go through a process of initial resistance, pseudo-acceptance, reevaluation, true acceptance and institutionalization. By 1980, bilingual education had entered a period of reevaluation.

2. Myths and Misunderstandings

A second reason for resistance to bilingual education has been a failure to dispel myths and misunderstandings. In professional and lay criticisms, little attention is given to language transition, implying that the native language will be used indefinitely. Diehards propagate the "theory of interference" which erroneously states that children allowed to use their native language will have difficulty learning English. It should be noted that the United States is probably the only country in the world where this phenomenon is believed to occur. According to a noted psycholinguist, there are more bilingual than monolingual people in the world today.

Since language transitions can be accomplished in a couple of years, educators and the general public believe bilingual efforts begun in kindergarten could be discontinued by the end of the third grade. This does not sound unreasonable, but children with limited proficiency in English are found at all grade levels. Only 50 percent of these children are in kindergarten through grade three, 25 percent are in grades four through six, and 25 percent in grades seven through twelve. A bilingual program limited to kindergarten through grade three would fail to address the needs of half of these children. Opponents and the media present bilingual education in the higher grades as a continuation from the lower levels, implying an eight grade bilingual program would automatically provide eight years of continuous bilingual schooling.

One opponent has suggested that the "affirmative ethnicity" promoted by bilingual education could lead to a movement for a separatist Hispanic state in this country. The irony of this assertion is that almost all litigation for bilingual education arose from Hispanic supported school desegregation efforts beginning in the 1940s and predating the landmark 1954 *Brown* decision.

Critics complain that this bilingual approach is too expensive for educational institutions concerned with instructing language minority students. Assuming that a bilingual program may cost an additional $200 to $250 per pupil per year, it is difficult to accept this criticism. The built-in retention of ESL programs has an accompanying cost currently exceeding

$2,000 per pupil per year in most states. Student placement in bilingual education for two or three years costs less than half the expenditure for placement in an ESL program according to research by the Intercultural Development Research Association. The cost of not using a bilingual approach and choosing an ESL program instead can be prohibitive.

3. Inadequate Evaluation

A third reason for resistance to bilingual education is the widespread discussion of a single evaluation. Despite evidence of success from the Center for Applied Linguistics, the Office of Bilingual Education and many other sources, opponents of bilingual education quote a study conducted by the American Institute of Research (AIR) under contract with the U.S. Office of Education.

The study's mixed findings are interpreted to mean that the promise of bilingual education is not being realized. The AIR finding that over 50 percent of the teachers in bilingual programs analyzed for the study spoke no language other than English was lost in the furor of disappointment and opposition. Over 40 percent of the same teachers who taught in bilingual education programs indicated that they had received three days or less of training in this new and radically different instructional approach. The AIR report should have concluded that bilingual education programs presented by teachers who are not bilingual and not trained in this methodology are not succeeding.

Considering that bilingual education has been an innovative program, it has faced great barriers in its implementation. The question now is more than whether bilingual education is working. The question that should be posed is, "Under what conditions do bilingual education programs work?" It should be answered using a research methodology that allows for multivariate analysis. Evaluation design should identify factors necessary for success in bilingual education, such as minimum teacher fluency required in the native language, the amounts and types of training, the point at which a transition could best be made, preferred types of organization, and the adequacy of materials and instruction.

The history of innovation in education indicates that the period of reevaluation will be followed by true acceptance or rejection. During this period it is crucial that this judgment be made upon the merits of bilingual education, based on adequate study rather than on myths and misinformation. ■

IFG NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Adrienne Bailey
Past President, National Association of State Boards of Education
Chicago, Illinois
Steven Bailey
School of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Jose Cardenas
Intercultural Development Research Association
San Antonio, Texas
Joseph Cronin
President, Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corporation
Boston, Massachusetts
James S. Coleman
Sociology Department
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois
Ruth Love
Superintendent
Chicago School District
Chicago, Illinois
Richard Merritt
Political Science Department
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois
Armando Menocal, III
Public Advocates, Inc.
San Francisco, California
Susan Nelson
Staff of the Council of Economic Advisors
Washington, D.C.
Burton Weisbrod
Economics Department
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin
Mark Yudof
School of Law
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

SUPPORT AND ADVOCACY: INTEREST GROUP GROWTH

Since the significantly increased federal involvement in education during the 1960s, interest groups have played a more active and more important role in forming and implementing education legislation. Categorical aid programs have generated their own support groups organized to lobby and advocate for particular groups of needy pupils. California provides an example of this style of politics in education.

Professional bilingual education associations and language minority interest groups in California have emerged and grown over the past fifteen years because of the 1974 *Lau* decision mandating bilingual education and increased state and federal funding for such instruction. During the 1979-80 legislative session, a coalition of interest groups won a two-year battle for an improved bilingual education law for California. But their victory may be short-lived in the face of "decentralization," "deregulation," and "decategorization." Education is slated to receive a substantial share of the proposed federal budget cuts. Bilingual education may be severely cut because policymakers do not generally see it as integral to basic educational programs. Interest groups will need new strategies for continued coalition, increased action at the local level, and creative alternatives for financial resources.

California is an important case to consider because it receives approximately one-fourth of the national Title VII budget, or $39.6 million. With another $25 million of state and district funds allocated to bilingual programs, California serves almost 330,000 students with limited proficiency in English, more than any other state. In addition, California now has over 9000 certificated bilingual teachers and another 4500 teaching in bilingual programs under a waiver provision. It is estimated that over 80% of these state and federal bilingual funds are expended for certificated and classified salaries and benefits.

New federal programs and increased funding resulted from Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, legislated in 1968 and amended in 1974 and 1978. While originally intended to target Spanish-speaking students in the Southwest who constitute the largest language minority, the legislation was later broadened to include all language minorities. Voluntary bilingual legislation was passed in California in 1972 (AB2284). The later legislation of 1976 (AB1329) and 1980 (AB507) mandated bilingual education and provided additional funding for school districts.

This new money attracted the attention and support of language minority groups and professional educators who formed many interest groups and associations. Memberships of these groups are dedicated to public advocacy for the special needs of language minority students.

The Association of Mexican American Educators (AMAE) was founded in 1976 before the passage of any bilingual education legislation. In the middle and late 1960s, AMAE played an active role in pro-

moting the entry of Chicano and Mexican-American students into postsecondary education and advocating dropout prevention and affirmative action programs at all levels of education.

In 1969, another organization was created by the teachers in English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, called the California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL).

The California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE) was formed in 1975, when there were many more bilingual programs. Although there is some overlap in the memberships of CABE and AMAE, each organization has a unique constituency and function. CABE's membership is ethnically diverse, occupationally homogenous, and its activities relate directly to bilingual education, while AMAE is ethnically homogenous, occupationally diverse, and its activities cover a broad range of educational issues related to Latino students.

The language minority and bilingual interest groups range in size from 50 to 2000, but none can compare in size or resources with the California Teachers Association (CTA) and the California Federation of Teachers (CFT), which represent 125,000 and 30,000 members respectively. These two large teacher unions also represent some AMAE and CABE members in collective bargaining. The number of credentialed bilingual teachers and teachers working with waivers is sizable within CTA and CFT (affiliated with the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, respectively). AMAE has a designated CTA liason on its executive board in order to coordinate relations between the two groups and AMAE members are active in NEA's Hispanic Caucus.

CTA took the lead early in 1979 to determine the nature and wording of the Bilingual Education Reform Act (AB 507). Immediately after the legislation was introduced, the California Bilingual Community Coalition formed. While pursuing the proposed legislation, AMAE, CABE, CATESOL and other organizations who made up the coalition worked together to reconcile differences in their goals and recruited other interest groups with similar goals and common values. Membership in the coalition grew to twenty organizations and included the California Association for Asian Bilingual Education, the Los Angeles County Bilingual Directors' Association, and the Mexican American School Boards Association.

CTA's key role in the bilingual coalition became evident near the end of the 1980 legislative session, when some CTA members objected to wording in AB 507 protecting bilingual teachers from layoffs.

Language Minority Interest Groups in California

Organization	Membership Size	Year of Origin	Organizational Unit
AMAE (Association of Mexican American Educators, Inc.)	500	1965	36 chapters
CATESOL (California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages)	1700	1969	15 regions
LACBDA (Los Angeles County Bilingual Directors Association)	50	1972	52 districts
CAFABE (California Association for Asian Bilingual Education)	150	1974	not applicable
CABE (California Association for Bilingual Education)	870	1975	20 chapters
MASBA (Mexican American School Boards Association)	100	1976	not applicable
Teacher Unions in California			
CTA (California Teachers Association)	125,000	1875	780 chapters
CFT (California Federation of Teachers)	29,700	1916	235 locals

CTA succeeded in removing the language from the bill, despite the strenuous objections from other groups in the coalition. CTA support for AB 507 was critical, as was CFT's support, and both were key factors in the bill's passage. Although CFT never joined the bilingual coalition, it was very active in the legislative controversy seeking to amend the existing legislation.

Imperiled Progress

Forthcoming changes in categorical programs, especially in bilingual education, threaten the survival of the smaller interest groups. For example, the number of dues-paying members of bilingual organizations will diminish if the funding level for bilingual education is substantially decreased and jobs in that program are lost. This situation is exacerbated by the loss of protection from layoffs which had been sought but lost in the legislation. The federal administration has succeeded in securing an 18% budget cutback for federal Title VII funds for the next three years. California's share of that budget cut will be quite large because it is the state with the largest number of students with limited proficiency in English and receives the largest amount of Title VII funds.

In addition to withstanding budget cuts, interest groups will have to anticipate consolidation of categorical funds into block grants, a proposal high on the priority list for federal education legislation. Large-scale attempts to "decategorize" would mean that the separation between specially-funded programs would disappear and local discretion would channel federal funds to needy pupils. Interest groups also would face a more difficult time in advocating special funds at state and federal levels and would need to focus greater effort at the district level.

Most supporters of bilingual instruction and particularly members of bilingual interest groups share strong altruistic goals and often have lifetime commitments to meet the special educational needs of language and ethnic minority students. These humanistic concerns add to the vigor of their efforts when threatened with curtailed bilingual services. Policymakers and school administrators would make their own tasks less difficult and more successful by systematically incorporating the input of organized counstituent groups, such as bilingual interest groups, into their decisions. At the same time, the bilingual interest groups will have to sustain the high level of activity and public advocacy which they attained during their legislative victories in California if they are to overcome the current obstacles they face: budget cut-backs and rescissions, proposed consolidation of categorical programs, and the abdication of much federal involvement in the education of linguistic minorities. ■

briefly . . .

In its research on the structure and financing of public education, IFG has examined various federal categorical aid programs. Several of our past issues have documented that research. This issue of *Policy Notes* is concerned with another federal categorical program: Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Bilingual Education. This program provides funding to instruct approximately 350,000 students in 79 languages as well as English. In addition, most states have developed supplementary programs for students who have a limited proficiency in English.

Hispanic students comprise the largest group of any one language minority and most Hispanics in this country reside in the Southwest or California. In 1979, nearly one million Hispanic students attended California schools alone, representing 24 percent of the kindergarten through twelfth grade population. While present IFG research focuses on this large group of Spanish-speaking students, it should not be inferred that all language minority students have the same school experiences.

Beatriz Arias served as the consulting editor for this issue and wrote the article "Can Diversity in Schools Be Accommodated?", a discussion of desegregation and bilingual education as remedies for educational inequity. Dr. Arias is an associate professor of Education at Stanford University.

The lead article, "Bilingual Education for Hispanics" was written by Michael Olivas, the national Director of Research for the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC). His discussion of the educational conditions experienced by Hispanics provides background information for the other articles. A more extensive analysis is available in Michael Olivas' forthcoming IFG Paper "Research on Hispanic Education: Students, Finance, and Governance," his forthcoming article in *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, "Federal Higher Education Policy: The Case of Hispanics," and in the book, *The Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, #065-00000023-7, available in English and Spanish for $7.00 from GPO, Washington, D.C. 20402).

Jose Cardenas provides an advocate's point of view in his guest editorial, "Views and Voices: An Historical Perspective". Cardenas is the Director of the Intercultural Development Research Association in Texas, and a member of IFG's National Advisory Board.

Two articles in this issue are a part of the active research which continues at IFG. Melinda Melendez, a graduate student in Stanford's School of Education, has worked extensively with bilingual education interest groups. "Support and Advocacy: Interest Group Growth" documents the increase in the number and size of these groups since the enactment of the Title VII legislation.

Maria Torres, another graduate student in Education at Stanford, analyzes the preliminary findings from her study of participation in schools by parents who speak little or no English in "Current Research on Parents and Schools".

The illustration on page 1 was created by Barbara Mendelson, an artist at Stanford News & Publications. ■

CAN DIVERSITY IN SCHOOLS BE ACCOMMODATED?

Desegregation law and desegregation remedies have been devised primarily to equalize educational access for English-speaking blacks. However, applying this law and these remedies to settings with a variety of racial and ethnic groups and large numbers of students who do not speak English may not alleviate the effects of segregative practices.

The available research literature on biracial (black and white) school desegregation is extensive and the majority of school desegregation remedies have been concerned with biracial school populations. The changing historical, legal, and demographic contexts of desegregation today is forcing us to reconceptualize and reexamine conventional school desegregation efforts as they might apply to multiracial school populations. Although recent court decisions on desegregation have extended minority status to Hispanics, researchers and educators are finding there is little information to assist them in determining effective remedies.

Beginning with the landmark *Brown* decision in 1954, blacks have been the principal plaintiffs and advocates of educational equity through desegregation litigation. However, blacks have not been the only group to suffer the effects of school segregation. Throughout the United States, particularly in the Southwest, Hispanics have endured the burdens of racial isolation and unequal access to educational resources. In both California and Texas, the experiences of Chicanos in schools suggest that the delivery of instructional services has also been unequal. (The terms "Chicano" and "Mexican-American" are used interchangeably and refer to the subgroup of Hispanics that is of Mexican origin or descent living in the U.S.)

De jure as well as *de facto* segregation of Mexican-American students has existed for decades, and has been institutionalized outside of schools by discriminatory practices in the labor market, housing industry, and schools. This segregation has been justified on the grounds that the students' limited skills in English necessitated separate schools or programs, presumably to provide special remedial assistance which usually never materialized. Such practices and discriminatory policies adopted by school boards with little or no Chicano representation have helped to maintain segregated schools and educational services.

While there is great diversity among various Hispanic subgroups (Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Central and South Americans and their descendants) with regard to socio-economic status, English and Spanish language proficiency and usage patterns, degree of acculturation, and physical characteristics, Hispanics as a group have been profoundly affected by racism, language discrimination and national origin status. For this reason, the entire group is included in a broad category of "minority students" that is entitled to educational redress in school desegregation decisions. It wasn't until 1970 that a federal district judge in Texas ruled that Mexican-Americans should be treated as an "identifiable ethnic minority group" (*Cisneros v. Corpus Christi*, 1970). The body of precedents of this minority status grew rapidly and now includes other Hispanics as well as Asians. Hence, the terminology of school desegregation planning has been expanded by using the terms "tri-ethnic" and "multiracial" to describe districts where a third or fourth group of numeric significance requires separate consideration.

Mexican-American students have participated as plaintiffs in many suits to reduce educational inequities. In the *Cisneros* case of 1970, the court ruled that the combination of two minority groups, Negroes (sic) and Mexican-Americans, in the same school but apart from whites did not achieve a unitary system. In *Keyes v. Denver School District* (1973 and 1975) the court

asserted that Mexican-Americans had suffered discrimination similar to blacks, were an identifiable minority, and that the degree of segregation in any given school depended upon the ratio of whites to the combined number of identifiable minority students (black and Mexican-American) in that school. *Keyes* (1975) also indicated that a meaningful desegregation plan must help Hispanic school children reach the proficiency in English necessary to learn other basic subjects.

There is confusion about the language rights and access rights of Hispanic students that has led to some resistance to desegregation efforts by public school officials. The illusion of an incompatibility between bilingual education and desegregation can encourage devisiveness among minority groups over questions of appropriate remedies for desegregation.

Bilingual education and desegregation can be readily accommodated in the same school setting. Planning is the key factor, especially in multiracial and multicultural schools. In these settings, the diversity of the student population requires providing for both the access to educational resources and the benefit from equal educational opportunity. School desegregation and bilingual education are remedies fashioned to provide both access and benefit.

Although bilingual education and desegregation can be pitted against each other as mutually exclusive remedies, the legal precedent established by *Keyes* is clear: "Bilingual education . . . is not a substitute for desegregation. Although bilingual instruction may be required to prevent racial isolation of minority students in a predominantly Anglo school system . . . such instruction must be subordinate to a plan of school desegregation." Bilingual education can be developed as a component of a desegregation remedy but it cannot be the remedy for segregated school systems.

Increasing numbers of Chicano students attend racially isolated urban schools, burdened with a characteristic lag of educational achievement compared to the national average. They come from homes where Spanish is usually spoken and from communities where the unemployment and underemployment rates are significantly greater than those of whites. Demographic trends indicate an out-migration of whites to the suburbs and an accelerating in-migration and growth of diverse minority populations in urban core areas. As desegregation remedies are being planned for these schools, researchers and educational planners need information to assist them in determining effective remedies for multiracial contexts, particularly those including significant numbers of Chicanos.

Hispanic public school students are in need of either school desegregation, bilingual education or both. Each of these efforts aims at providing equal educational opportunity, a guaranteed right under the U.S. Constitution. As such, each derives from statutes, regulations and case law. Each tries to redress the educational inequities endured by generations of Hispanics. Given the trends toward increasing racial isolation of Hispanics from whites in both elementary and secondary schools across the nation and the number of students with limited proficiency in English population, there is a pressing need to develop a unitary school system which recognizes the linguistic and cultural needs, as well as the diversity of this student population. ■

CURRENT RESEARCH ON PARENTS AND SCHOOLS

Parents have a deep and legitimate concern about the educational progress of their children. Indeed, parent participation in schools is a goal of many categorically funded programs, but barriers often keep minority parents from contributing to school decisions. Language is one important barrier for parents, as well as for students. In an ongoing IFG study, Maria Torres is finding that language as a barrier may be diminishing and that this may be the consequence of participation on bilingual parent advisory committees.

Previous research on citizen participation provides evidence that people of high socio-economic status engage in more participatory activities than those of low socio-economic status. A consistant finding is that whites participate more than non-whites but when socio-economic status is held constant, blacks show equal or higher levels of participation in certain types of activities. This finding does not hold true for Mexican-Americans. One study on the political and social participation of ethnic populations in Houston found that Mexicanos/Chicanos participate less than Anglos and blacks, even when the effects of socio-economic status are controlled.

Despite traditional and deep roots for citizen participation in American education, groups making decisions in schools are not representative of the minority populations served by the school. Most advisory councils are made up of white, English-speaking women of higher socio-economic status while minority populations are marginal participants.

Although state and federal legislation mandates participation on bilingual advisory committees (BACs) by parents of children enrolled in bilingual programs, little is known about who participates or how school characteristics affect their participation. The Torres study of parent participation at elementary schools is a step toward answering these questions. Preliminary findings from interviews with parents indicate that women are more frequently involved than men in the schools their children attend. This confirms the results of previous research and is explained by the mother's central role in the early socialization of children.

Other preliminary evidence suggests that the women who participate on BACs are from low-income families and speak Spanish as their primary language. Although the intent of the BAC is primarily an executive one to monitor and evaluate bilingual programs, its unintended consequence may be increased participation by parents not ordinarily involved in school decisions. The BAC may serve as a vehicle for involving low-income minority parents in their children's schooling.

With the presence of bilingual instruction in schools, more Spanish is spoken and more Spanish-speaking personnel can be found among the administrative and teaching staff. When the school environment reflects the cultural diversity of the classroom, student motivation and achievement increase and parental attitudes toward the school become more favorable. The majority of parents interviewed favored maintaining Spanish as the home language and teaching English and Spanish in schools. Of parents who were members of bilingual advisory committees, the majority participated only in bilingual education activities. Their involvement on other school committees generally occurred when the school had a joint school advisory committee. Their interaction with school personnel is almost exclusively with Spanish speakers and primarily with the bilingual teachers.

The state and federal regulations governing bilingual programs stipulate that parents of students in those programs should take part in making school decisions and should compose the majority of the bilingual advisory committee members. The focus on parents of students in bilingual programs rather than parents or citizens in general is an important one as it includes parents not usually involved in school advisory committees. ■

WET INK

Recent publications listed below can be ordered through Sandra L. Kirkpatrick, assistant director for dissemination at IFG. In addition to these publications, IFG has published numerous reports over the past two years. Abstracts are available upon request.

Pub. Code		
81-A8	SCHOOL FINANCE REFORM AND SPECIAL EDUCATION	William T. Hartman and Theda R. Haber
81-A9	REVENUE/EXPENDITURE LIMITS AND OVERRIDE ELECTIONS: THE EXPERIENCE OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS	Jack W. Osman and John M. Gemello
81-A10	SOCIAL SCIENCE UTILIZATION IN STATE LEGISLATURES	Douglas E. Mitchell
81-B5	PROBLEMS OF COMPLEX SYSTEMS: A MODEL OF SYSTEM PROBLEM SOLVING APPLIED TO SCHOOLS	Robert A. Cooke and Denise M. Rousseau
81-B6	SCHOOL OUTCOMES OF CHRONICALLY ILL CHILDREN AND THEIR SIBLINGS: A MULTIVARIATE APPROACH	Barbara L. Wolfe
81-B7	SOURCES OF BLACK-WHITE EARNINGS DIFFERENCES	Eric A. Hanushek
81-B8	PROJECTING SPECIAL EDUCATION COSTS	William T. Hartman
81-B9	SOCIOLOGIC, ECONOMIC, AND POLICY INFLUENCES ON COLLEGE-GOING DECISIONS	Gregory A. Jackson
81-B10	ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS AFFECTING LEGALIZATION IN EDUCATION	John W. Meyer
81-C2	THE DREAM DEFERRED: A GOLDEN AGE FOR WOMEN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS	Elizabeth Hansot and David Tyack

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON EDUCATIONAL FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE
CERAS Building
Stanford, California 94305-1691
(415) 497-0957

IFG

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Palo Alto, Calif.
Permit No. 28

IFG Policy Perspectives

Autumn 1981

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON EDUCATIONAL FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE

TITLE VII, BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Developing Issues of Diversity and Equity

By M. Beatriz Arias and Richard Navarro

In 1968, Congress established a new categorical aid program to address the special educational needs of low-income students with limited proficiency in English. The Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was intended as a demonstration program and provided the major federal support for non-Engish instruction for limited English speakers.

Prior to 1968, virtually every state prohibited the use of any language other than English as the main medium of instruction. The availability of these federal categorical funds through Title VII put pressure on states to revise their statutes and allow the use of languages other than English in the school curricula, beyond those sanctioned for foreign language instruction. This change in state education codes is one example of the impact that this categorical aid program has had on school language policies.

Bilingual education is the use of two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction.

From the beginning, the U.S. Office of Education defined bilingual education as: "... the use of two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction for the same pupil population in a well-organized program which encompasses all or part of the curriculum and includes the study of the history and culture associated with the mother tongue. A complete program develops and maintains the children's self-esteem and legitimate pride in both cultures."

The participants were to be children who were not only limited in their English proficiency, but also to some extent, children who were proficient in English. This bilingual education effort was to be much more comprehensive than the long established English as a Second Language program, which had stressed immersion in an English-only curriculum for a portion of the school day.

Bilingual education was a relatively new approach to English language instruction, appearing during an era when compensatory efforts were considered to be the proper response for providing equality of educational opportunity. A common assumption of the enacting legislation was that children with limited proficiency in English (from here on referred to as language minority) from low-income backgrounds could be helped out of poverty by eliminating the language barrier through compensatory efforts. Therefore, bilingual education represented the federal commitment toward improving conditions of equity for language minority students.

Since the first debates on bilingual education in Washington D.C., arguments have centered on whether introducing the mother tongue for instruction represents an appropriate response to the needs of low-income language minority students, or whether it represents an un-American, ill-conceived program that would promote ethnic nationalism and separatist rhetoric. The debate remains unresolved. The refrain can still be heard, "If they want to speak their own language, let them go back to their own country," ignoring the many native-language bastions within the U.S.

M. Beatriz Arias is an assistant professor in the School of Education at Stanford University in the field of Curriculum and Teacher Education. Her special interests include desegregation and evaluation. Richard Navarro is a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at Stanford University and is completing a dissertation on bilingual education and desegregation.

Various critics have portrayed bilingual education as a movement toward ethnic autonomy or as an example of minority language group politics. This view ignores the pedagogical characteristics of bilingual education as implemented by Title VII. Indeed, the federal bilingual effort (Title VII) is only *one* type of bilingual model, a transitional model, and is, by definition, fundamentally concerned with the effective teaching and learning of English by language minority students rather than the maintenance of the mother tongue.

While studies of bilingual education have addressed several aspects of the Title VII program, evidence on the effectiveness of specific Title VII approaches has yet to answer the major research questions:

- What are the different ways in which bilingual education is being implemented in the schools?
- What are effective educational approaches for providing bilingual education to children who don't speak English or have limited proficiency in English?
- What should be the federal role in aiding low income students with special language needs?

In large measure, the fact that research has not yet provided answers to these questions stems from the very rapid growth and development of Title VII programs and their extraordinary diversity in terms of linguistic groups and educational settings. In an environment of great change and variability, it has been difficult to set out research designs which can be used to obtain results that are both applicable and generalizable in a more stable situation. As the programs become better defined in the maturing phase of Title VII, researchers will be able to focus more sharply on the issues and provide important insights.

EA 015 257

The evolution of bilingual education in this country illustrates the importance of these issues as they have been elaborated and refined in the last twelve years. There have been three distinct phases of this evolution. The first phase is one of program identification and clarification. The second is a capacity building period and the third is the current redefinition and reauthorization effort.

Phase I 1968-1974: The Identification of Educational Objectives

In the beginning, Title VII legislation shared the stage of social action programs and benefitted from the civil rights movement of the same time period. The educational, social and political aspects of bilingual education were summed up by one spokesman: "Bilingual education is much more than an educational program. It is symbolic of the Hispanic request for educational opportunity and, beyond that, for social and political opportunity."

During the first years of Title VII implementation, administrators grappled with the issue of programmatic goals regarding the status of the native language. The labels "maintenance," "transition", and "enrichment" were used both by the U.S. Office of Education (USOE)and local education agencies. However, adaptation of these terms, which had been used to describe bilingual educational efforts outside the United States, was inappropriate to the stated intent of the Title VII guidelines. These guidelines spoke only to the use of the first language for language minority students until the transfer to English could be made. Both maintenance and enrichment bilingual education require the elaboration and systematic development of the mother tongue, while transitional bilingual education requires only initial literacy in the native language, followed by the introduction of English. While the term "maintenance" in the original definition applies only to those bilingual programs which sustain the development of the two languages, it has frequently been misused to describe projects which systematically phase out the native language.

A recommendation of a Title VII evaluation in 1973 addressed the issue: "It appears appropriate for USOE to determine whether it will require that a transfer or maintenance program be implemented or whether it will be at the discretion of the local education agency." Furthermore, this report noted the variation in definitions, including biingualism, language dominance, proficiency and bilingual programs, stating that the lack of standard definitions severely limits uniform program implementation. The policy of funding pilot programs with varying approaches was recommended for re-evaluation and standardization.

Title VII was amended in August 1974 by the education amendments (20 U.S.C. 821) creating the Office of Bilingual Education and establishing new guidelines for program implementation and evaluation. This amendment attempted to resolve the question of Congressional intent. It clearly stated that all programs should have the intended purpose of transferring students from their native language to English. However, Congress also left open the option of maintaining instruction in the native language if local decision makers determined that it was a desirable objective. In either transitional or maintenance programs, the amendments stated that language instruction had to include both native language and cultural enrichment.

The atmosphere surrounding the 1974 amendment was further colored by the Supreme Court's *Lau v. Nichols* decision, handed down in January of that year. The decision relied on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which outlawed discrimination in federally funded programs. Using this statute, the Supreme Court determined that equality of treatment was not achieved merely by providing students who spoke only Chinese with the same facilities, textbooks and curricula as students who spoke only English (414 U.S. 593). In this ruling the Court determined that in order to assure language minority children a meaningful opportunity to participate in educational programs, public schools must address the unique language needs of these children. In reaching its decision, the Court did not specify a remedy, stating instead that there are several alternative approaches which might be acceptable to remedy discrimination against language minority students.

The educational language policy elaborated in the *Lau* decision affirmed the responsibility of the schools to do something for students with limited proficiency in English. This decision was based on the principle that language constituted a barrier to equal access to public education. It is important to stress that the motivation for this policy did not stem from a value for bilingualism or an appreciation for the cultural enrichment of a language other than English, but from a need to redress the educational inequities endured by ethnolinguistic minorities. This language policy permits bilingualism for a single group — the linguistically excluded student. The U.S. has not yet developed an educational language policy which addresses second language education for all students.

In summary, the clarification and refinement of the Title VII bilingual education program was completed by 1974. Supported by the *Lau* recommendations, and spurred by a national ethnic-awareness movement, the Title VII program redressed language barriers to learning in the schools while recognizing the hegemony of English.

Phase II 1974-1979: The Capacity Building Years

The years following the 1974 bilingual education amendments witnessed the

Table I:
Title VII Programs from 1969 to 1980

Year	Basic Programs	Participants	Languages*	Appropriations (millions)
69-70	76	26,521	14	7.5
70-71	131	51,918	16	21.25
71-72	164	83,748	16	25
72-73	217	108,816	24	35
73-74	209	129,380	30	45
74-75	383	236,000	34	58
75-76	381	268,500	47	85
76-77	400	191,718	59	98
77-78	425	259,364	67	115
78-79	565	302,000	70	135
79-80	565	350,000	79	158

*Figures are approximations due to different procedures for counting dialects.

Sources: *Bilingual Education: An Unmet Need*, Report to Congress by the Comptroller General's Office, May 19, 1976

George Blanco, "The Education Perspective" in *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives Vol* 4. Center for Applied Linguistics. 1977

Guide to Title VII Programs, National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

greatest growth in the number of basic programs funded by Title VII, as well as a substantial increase in the total program appropriations. This funding provided for the basic programs and also for auxiliary services to support the implementation of the bilingual approach. Auxiliary services are an important part of the Title VII network and include materials development centers, dissemination and assessment centers, training resource centers, fellowship programs and training grant programs. This period, 1974-1979, has been designated "capacity building" due in large part to the increase in basic programs and appropriations and also to the presence of a support structure for maximizing the bilingual approach through materials, training and research.

Table I displays the increase in basic programs and students, in languages served and in total appropriations from 1969-1980. The greatest increase in both projects and number of participating students occurred during the 1974-1975 funding cycle. It is clear from this table that what had begun as a small demonstration and pilot program had evolved into a significant service program by 1974, when it served over 236,000 students.

The Title VII classroom is characterized by diversity . . . in languages . . . in student proficiency and acculturation.

Growth in the Title VII programs and participants was paralleled and sustained by an elaboration of the *Lau* guidelines. These guidelines provided that specific educational remedies be provided for language minority students. School districts attempting to comply with this regulation could look to a Title VII "type" of bilingual education as one approach sanctioned by the Offices of Education and Civil Rights.

National demographic trends also supported the expansion of Title VII. Surveys conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) estimated the student population eligible to participate in bilingual programs to be approximately 3.6 million in 1976. Yet the number of students actually participating by 1979 (350,000) was only 10 percent of the total eligible. Increases in the absolute number of students identified also meant an increase in the number of native languages to be served, highlighting the acute shortages of teachers and curriculum material specific to each language. Consequently, capacity building included the establishment of materials development centers, training resource centers and training grant programs charged with developing the materials and pedagogical approaches necessary for supporting the diverse Title VII programs. Because the fundamental challenge of bilingual education was to meet the educational needs of a diverse student population, the capacity building effort had to address not only the scarcity of materials and personnel in any target language, but also pedagogical techniques which would meet the needs of language minority students.

The Title VII classroom is characterized by diversity, not only in the languages served, but also in student language proficiency and acculturation. The predominant type of Title VII bilingual classroom is at the elementary school level where a teacher typically interacts with students of varied linguistic and cultural backgrounds in a self-contained room. Even though Spanish/English bilingual projects comprise over 80 percent of the basic programs in urban settings, it is not unusual to find students from Armenian, Korean and Chinese backgrounds in one classroom. Another common configuration is a predominantly Hispanic classroom which includes students who are recent arrivals from Cuba or Central America combined with second and third generation Chicanos. The first example is not really a bilingual classroom, but rather a multilingual classroom with students at various stages of acculturation. While there may be only two languages involved in the second classroom, students who are recent arrivals to the U.S. and don't speak English are joined by others who have lived in this country most of their lives and have a limited command of English. In this setting there is also a variation in the extent of acculturation.

The difficulty . . implementing bilingual education is intensified by the low socioeconomic background of the students and a very high mobility/transfer rate. It is estimated 10-20 percent of students who enter a bilingual school at kindergarten remain through the fourth grade. Given these conditions, a broad and flexible definition of the bilingual approach is necessary to accommodate such diverse student characteristics.

The complexity of these variables has made it difficult to determine the one "best" way to instruct language minority students in English. This is further confounded by the age of the learner, the extent of exposure to the native language and English, the learner's socio-economic background, and the historical and societal contexts of racial isolation or immigration. By the end of the capacity building years, after almost a decade of Title VII education efforts, it became evident that the same instructional methodology could not be applied to Armenian, Chinese, Spanish or Tagalog speaking students. Even within the Hispanic groups, different strategies had to be used, depending upon the language proficiency and cultural background of the student.

BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IN THE U.S.

In 1979-1980, California had the largest number of Title VII basic demonstration programs with 140 projects (26%). New York was second with 92 projects (17%); Texas followed with 69 projects (13%); Arizona has 26 projects (5%); New Mexico has 24 projects (4%); New Jersey has 14 projects (3%); and Colorado has 11 (2%). There were ten states in which Title VII projects did not operate, including Alabama, Arkansas, Iowa, Kentucky, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Carolina, and West Virginia.

Forty one states have bilingual provisions and the policies vary. California has the most comprehensive bilingual policy for addressing the educational needs of language minority students. However, all state policies as well as federal ones are facing serious challenges. For example, a law requiring bilingual instruction in Colorado's kindergartens through third grades has been repealed. Similar efforts to weaken or eliminate existing bilingual statutes were narrowly defeated in California, Illinois and Massachusetts.

Texas now has stronger bilingual requirements, due to a district court judge in *U.S. vs. Texas* who found overwhelming evidence of discrimination against Chicanos. He ordered the state to provide bilingual education from kindergarten through twelfth grade within a six year period and the legislature has enacted legislation that extends bilingual education to the sixth grade.

Phase III 1978-Present: Reflection, Deregulation and Reauthorization

After the first decade of Title VII, bilingual educators and researchers made a concerted effort to synthesize the experience and reflect on the elaboration of the program. In the eyes of many advocates of bicultural education, too much media attention had been given to detractors of the program without adequately considering the complexity of the problem and without adequately defining the Title VII approach to bilingual education.

More research is clearly needed in the area of second language acquisition focusing on various types of bilingual education approaches. Research on the effectiveness of Title VII bilingual education has been difficult for several reasons: 1) the appropriate assessment instruments were lacking, 2) the start-up time required to fully

implement a project is lengthy, and 3) financial support for research is limited.

The first concern of researchers was to provide assessment procedures or instruments which would effectively identify students' language proficiency in the native language and English. To aid in the assessment of content area skills, test developers explored translations of standardized measures. Every area of assessment and evaluation which involved language minority students was subject to scrutiny, often requiring screening for cultural or linguistic bias as well as tests for validity.

The effectiveness of bilingual projects could not be assessed until the curriculum, materials, texts and guides were well integrated into the student's educational program. This required the skill of trained personnel specializing in second language learning and its cultural ramifications. Teacher training grants and material dissemination centers were the last to be phased in and not until 1975 were the first Title VII trained teachers available.

Appropriate evaluations of bilingual education will be limited as long as the main question is "Does it work?"

With the development of Title VII has come a series of research studies which attempt to describe and characterize programmatic components including the linguistic characteristic of language minority students, parental involvement, student self-esteem, teacher and student behaviors, and classroom management. However, research on the effect of bilingual education approaches upon students' academic attainment awaits the maturation of Title VII programs and appropriate assessment procedures. Consequently, there is no simple answer to the general question about whether Title VII is effective in providing bilingual educational services. While some local educational agencies have shown extremely promising results from their Title VII bilingual programs, the larger question must remain unanswered until systematic study of several bilingual approaches is conducted on a national basis.

Evaluations of Title VII bilingual education have been criticized for over-emphasizing statistical significance rather than educational significance. At the national level, large scale evaluations of federal intervention efforts have rarely shown any positive gains. On the local level, district evaluations serve primarily as a compliance item and are rarely used by teachers in their curriculum decisions.

There have been three evaluations of the Title VII program. The first was a process evaluation conducted by Development Associates in 1973. This was followed in 1976 by a report to Congress from the Comptroller General's Office (GAO) entitled "Bilingual Education, an Unmet Need." and finally, the only national evaluation of Title VII Spanish/English bilingual education was completed by the American Institutes for Research (A.I.R.) in 1978.

The process evaluation selected a stratified sample of Spanish/English Title VII projects serving early elementary grades and documented the characteristics of students, staff and communities, the extent to which projects met their guidelines, and described the instructional components. The GAO study based its review on a secondary analysis of sixteen Spanish, Chinese, French, Portuguese, Crow and Kerasan projects. One of the interesting findings noted by this report was that even where Title VII projects were in place, many students with limited proficiency in English were not participating due to limited project resources.

The most comprehensive evaluation of the Title VII program has been the impact evaluation conducted under contract to the Office of Education by A.I.R. This evaluation focused only on Spanish/English projects which had been funded for four or five years. It came at a time when the development of appropriate instruments and curriculum materials was still in its infancy. This evaluation was not able to link educational experiences with outcome measures. In comparison with control students, the A.I.R. report found that Title VII programs had not been generally effective in increasing students' English language competence. Nevertheless, the report concludes that Title VII programs did produce "consistently encouraging results at all grade levels" in mathematics.

Appropriate evaluations of bilingual education will be limited as long as the main question is "Does it work?" The diversity of linguistic minorities and their backgrounds and the variety of institutional and community settings in which they receive their education mean that research must focus on what types of programs work for which particular groups. That is, there is not likely to be a single answer and a uniform national approach that will be effective under all conditions and situations for all groups. Thus, the major evaluation effort must necessarily focus on what instructional strategy is most effective for specific students.

Conclusion

When viewed from a broad perspective, Title VII has directly or indirectly had a wide-reaching impact on the national awareness of language minority issues. This awareness has grown at every level affected by state education codes including teacher preparation and certification, educational technology, and minority interest groups. In this sense, bilingual education has served as a reform movement challenging the education system. It was necessary to challenge the political, social and economic arenas in order to begin effective educational reform. Generations of neglect toward language minority students could not be redressed overnight because their educational condition reflects a systemic exclusion. Nevertheless, bilingual education has been effective at both reforming state educational language policy and incorporating previously disenfranchised parents and students.

The language minority population will not decrease. Language minority persons are located in every state in the Union. According to the Survey of Income and Education conducted by the Bureau of the Census in spring 1976, seven states had more than a million language minority residents. There were approximately 27.9 million individuals, or one in eight, with language backgrounds other than English in the U.S. Of school-aged children (6-18 years old), one in ten, or about five million, had language backgrounds other than English. Three million of them had Spanish backgrounds, constituting about 60 percent of all language minority persons under the age of 19.

Ultimately, the national interest is best served by a literate and informed public, and bilingual education can be a cornerstone to such a policy. The issues raised by bilingual education will not disappear. They will become even more important as the U.S. enters what appears to be a period of massive new immigrations, as indicated by the recent influx of Asians and Hispanics. Ignoring the issues or withdrawing commitments to existing education strategies without replacing them with better alternatives could contribute to the formation of a large underclass of language minority citizens excluded from full membership in society. Additionally, existing linguistic divisions could contribute to a more fragmented people. Either result may have untoward consequences for the future. ■

Additional copies of this ***Policy Perspective*** *may be obtained by writing to IFG, school of Education, CERAS Building, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-1691.*